

REMARKS

The non-final office action of April 20, 2010, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-15 remain in this application.

Amendments to Claims 1 and 6

Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to further define one or more aspects of the disclosure. Support for the amendments may be found in figure 14 and in paragraph 42 of the description. No new matter has been entered.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-5 have been amended to overcome the rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,623,529 to Lakritz. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As amended, claim 6 recites:

establishing a site-to-site interrelationship model
identifying provider and subscriber relationships between said
multiplicity of interrelated data sources, said model identifying in
said multiplicity of interrelated data sources a plurality of data
sources which are site content providers and at least one data
source which is both a site content subscribed and a site content
provider; ...

transferring said identified data representing changed content to at least one of said multiplicity of interrelated data sources identified as a site content subscriber in said model and at least one data source identified as both a site content subscriber and a site content provider in said model.

Applicants submit Lakritz fails to suggest claim 6 as amended.

Lakritz relates to a document localization, management and delivery system for multilingual web sites. The system automatically determines the language and country of a website visitor and directs a web-server to deliver the appropriate localized content contained in a country/language database to the visitor's browser. The visitor's browser is notified of the correct font and content encoding required to display the selected language. The visitor's browser then downloads the appropriate font and encoding files, enabling it to display the web site content in the appropriate language.

In short, Lakritz describes a master-slave system, i.e. when content in a master language on a master website changes, the system allows for translated versions of the master site to be downloaded to visitor's browsers in various languages. Multiple servers may be used in Lakritz, but there is only one master site in a master language.

In claim 6 as amended, when content changes on a provider site, corresponding changes are made to one or more subscriber sites, but not necessarily all the subscriber sites. Further, there may be more than one provider site in the arrangement of claim 6, not a single provider site corresponding to a master site as in Lakritz. Still further, in claim 6, some provider sites may also be subscriber sites.

Having more than one provider site and allowing sites to be both providers and subscribers means that the arrangement of claim 6 provides a more flexible system for keeping content up-to-date on a plurality of sites in a communications network. Content changes can flow in both directions between providers and subscribers and can be initiated by multiple providers allowing more complex content update operations to take place.

This is in contrast to Lakritz which employs a rigid master-slave approach where content change only passes in one direction from a single master to one or more slaves and not vice

versa. The flexible content updates of the arrangement of claim 6 are not possible in Lakritz, nor is there any consideration in Lakritz of providing such a flexible content update system.

For instance, the arrangement of claim 6 can be especially useful in a network of sites in different languages. If, for example a new press release is published on a German site in German, it may be desirable to have the press release translated for a related US site into English. Conversely, if a press release is published on the US site in English, it may be desirable to have the press release translated for the related German site into German. If either the German site is only a master and the US site is only a slave or vice versa as in the Lakritz prior art, then the desired content updates would not be possible. The approach of claim 6 facilitates such content updates due to the presence of a plurality of provider sites from which content updates can be initiated, and also sites which can be both providers and subscribers from which updates can be initiated and/or received. For these reasons, claim 6 is allowable over Lakritz.

Independent claim 1 is allowable for similar reasons.

Dependent claims 2-5 and 6-15 are allowable at least as being dependent on an allowable claim.

If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Director is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: October 20, 2010

By: /Christopher R. Glembocki/
Christopher R. Glembocki
Registration No. 38,800

1100 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001